REMARKS

Applicant has studied the Office Action dated February 24, 2005. Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1-21 are rejected. Claims 1-11, and 13-21 have been amended correcting for inadvertent errors and clarifying the novel aspects of the present invention. No new matter has been added with these amendments to the specification or the claims. Reconsideration and reexamination of this application are respectfully requested.

Priority of Invention and Objections to Specification

The Specification has been amended to contain a specific reference to claim priority to Korean Application No. 10-2000-0020317, under 35 U.S.C. 119(a). A certified copy of the above referenced Korean Application has been enclosed herewith.

§ 102 and 103 Rejections

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kung et al. (US 6,728,239). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A proper rejection for anticipation under § 102 requires complete identity of invention. The claimed invention, including each element thereof as recited in the claims, must be disclosed or embodied, either expressly or inherently, in a single reference. Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech Inc., 927 F.2d 1565, 1576, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991); Standard Havens Prods., Inc. v. Gencor Indus., Inc., 953 F.2d 1360, 1369, 21 U.S.P.Q.2d 1321, 1328 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

A rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 of obviousness requires both (1) a suggestion of the prior art to make and use the claimed device and that (2) one skilled in the art would be reasonably expected to make and use the compositions or device, or in carrying out the claimed process. In the instant case, the cited references, either alone or in combination, meet neither the 102 or the 103 requirements.

Kung is directed to an integrated scaleable PBX (Private branch exchange) that includes one or more broadband gateways. Each broadband gateway may be provided on a slot card (i.e., broadband gateway card) compatible with servers and personal computers. Central to Kung's system is the broadband gateway card. For example, Kung recites in independent claim 1 " . . . a device providing PBX services in an integrated broadband communication system, including: a server including a broadband gateway card . . . said

broadband gateway card including: at least one telephone interface coupled to a data bus . . . a transceiver coupled to said data bus for multiplexing and demultiplexing said information traffic between said broadband communication system and said broadband communication gateway card . . . "(Kung, claim 1, Figs. 3 and 4). "The transceiver is controlled by [a] controller and wherein said controller is coupled to a server data bus . . . " (Kung, claim1).

In summary, Kung teaches a broadband gateway card including a transceiver unit that provides voice, data, and video communication between the broadband communication gateway card and users of a multimedia system, such as broadband system including integrated telephone, television, and data network (Kung, claim1, abstract).

In contrast to Kung, the present invention is directed to a network connection apparatus that uses an internet phone as a hub while maintaining telephone functionality (Original Specification, pg. 3, lines 19-24). The present invention, in one embodiment, provides for an internet telephone setting-up a call when an audio signal is transmitted from outside the network through the ordinary telephone network (Original Specification, pg. 4, lines 6-14).

A PCM digital signal samples the transmitted analog audio signal in the ordinary telephone network (Original Specification, pg. 4, lines 6-14). The incoming call is judged as wired or wireless, in accordance with an IP or a unit address (Original Specification, pg. 4, lines 6-14). Various function packs are interfaced through the function extending unit 20. The various function packs are for example a network interface pack 26, a graphic-sound pack 25, a wireless LAN pack 24, an IEEE 1394 pack 23, an additional CPU pack 22, and an extension graphic-sound pack 21 (Original Specification, pg. 6, lines 10-22). When a large load device has requested processing by the main CPU 30c, an additional CPU pack 22 may be utilized for increased computational power (Original Specification, pg. 7, lines 8-17). The CPU pack 22 may also function as a stand alone PC and used, instead of the Network CPU, as a low-power mobile CPU.

In contrast to amended claim 1 of the present invention, Kung merely teaches, suggests, or motivates "peripheral ports module 24 may include a plurality of ports providing connectivity to external peripherals. Exemplary interfaces include PCI, Firewire, USB, DB25 . . . Devices which incorporate one or more of these interfaces may utilize the broadband residential gateway 300 . . ." (Kung, col. 18, lines 15-18). In addition, peripheral ports and a plurality of computational processors P1-P6 (308-318) are electrically connected to the processor bus 380 and integrated into the broadband communication system (Kung, see Fig. 3).

Thus, amended claim 1 reciting "a function extending unit for interfacing function packs each performing an independent function respectively with a network CPU unit" is novel over

the disclosure in Kung teaching processors electrically connected to the processor bus 380 and integrated in the broadband communication system. In other words, Kung fails to teach, suggest, or disclose a function extending unit, for example, providing extended computational power depending on the needs of a load device, such as video game or other user application.

In view of the above arguments, it is respectfully asserted that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness and, therefore, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references as are claims 2-13 by virtue of their dependence on claim 1.

Claims 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kung et al. (US 6,728,239). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states in the Office Action, in rejecting claim 14 and 15, that IP calls go to the internet telephone because gateway 300 supports internet telephony, col. 19, lines 20-21. However, amended claim 14 recites "transmitting sample PCM digital signals to an internet phone main unit when the call is from the wired connection." Kung fails to suggest making a decision based on the type of call. Instead, Kung merely teaches the availability of telephone connections within a network.

The Examiner also states "inherently, a Mobile IP (MIP) address which will contain the home agent and visiting agent addresses encapsulated in the MIP packet, and therefore, the call can be determined to be wire or wireless." However, the amended claim 14 recites "through a PSTN/IP network . . . sampling [occurs of] the transmitted analog signal with a PCM digital signal . . . [and] determining whether the call has a wired or wireless connection in accordance with the IP or device address of the sampled PCM digital signal . . ." Consequently, the present invention teaching the decision making process of choosing where to transmit the data, either internet phone or the PCI module, which is based on the IP or device address is not taught, suggested, or motivated by the disclosure in Kung even in light of the above inherency argument that the IP address is encapsulated in MIP packet. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that claim 14 is allowable over Kung. It is further respectfully asserted that claims 15-17 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on claim 14.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kung et al. (US 6,728,239). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Similar to the discussion above with respect to the rejection of claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Kung fails to teach or suggest a function extending unit that connects with interfacing function packs, for example, that allow computational power of the network

connection apparatus to be increased or decreased, depending on the needs of the load device, and function respectively independently with the Network CPU unit as claimed in amended claim 18. Thus, amended claim 18 is allowable.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kung et al. (US 6,728,239). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Kung fails to teach "using a network CPU through a network interface pack when a user requests an internet contact" as recited in amended claim 19. Kung, as discussed above, is directed to a system having peripheral ports and a plurality of processors P1-P6 (308-318) that are electrically connected to the processor bus 380 and are integrated into the broadband communication system (see Fig. 3, Kung). In contrast, claim 19 teaches that a network interface pack requests an internet contact independent of any request from a network CPU which is novel as compared to the disclosure in Kung. Thus, amended claim 19 is patently distinguishable over Kung and is therefore allowable. Furthermore, claims 20 and 21 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on claim 19.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-21 of the present application are in condition for allowance.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Dated: May 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

By: _____

Robert E Kasody
Registration No. 50,268
Attorney(s) for Applicant

Customer No. 035884

801 S. Figueroa Street, 14th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: 213-623-2221
Facsimile: 213-623-2211